

**REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-20 were pending. Claim 1-20 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1-20 are canceled. New claims 21- 28 are added. Claims 21-28 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benaloh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,216, hereinafter "Benaloh") in view of Cooper et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0051996, hereinafter "Cooper"). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejections.

Applicants believe, based on the Responses to Arguments in the pending office action, that there appears to be some confusion regarding what the Applicants' assert to be their invention. Therefore, prior to discussing the claims in particular, Applicants believe it will be helpful to discuss at least one embodiment described in the application. This embodiment is illustrative of many reasons the claims in the present application define an invention that is patentable over the cited art. The Applicants' claimed invention is directed towards uniquely identifying content in a highly distributed content delivery system such that an origin of unauthorized content use may be more accurately determined. Applicants' specification, page 4 lines 1-3. Figure 1 illustrates non-exhaustive examples of entities within the highly distributed content delivery system, including content owners, aggregators, service operators, and users. At any juncture within this highly distributed content delivery system, unauthorized access and misuse of the content might occur. Thus, such misuse could occur at, for example, a content owner's site, an aggregator's site, a service operator's site, and/or a user's site. Thus, as disclosed by Applicants' specification, it is meaningful to provide such digital copy protection and traceability at each network device along the highly distributed content delivery path to the user. Therefore, the network device disclosed in Applicants'

figure 2 may be embodied in content owners, aggregators, service operators, and users. See Applicants' specification, page 6 lines 18-20.

Thus, to clarify that each network device in the plurality of network devices in the highly distributed content delivery system may be configured to enable the tracing of content through the highly distributed content delivery system claims 1-20 have been canceled, and new claims 21-28 have been added. For example, new claim 21 recites, in part, a plurality of network devices, wherein each network device in the plurality is configured to perform actions, as further recited in at least claim 21. New claim 26 similarly recited, in a part, a network device in a plurality of network devices, wherein each network device...modifies the decrypted content by embedding at least one or a fingerprint or a watermark into the decrypted content, from a self-identifier. New Claim 28 also recites that for each network device in a plurality of network devices.

This is very much unlike cited prior art references Benaloh and Cooper. In Benaloh and in Cooper, only a first network device in their respectively described delivery systems is configured to perform watermarking or fingerprinting. See Cooper, Figure 2, for example; and Benaloh, Figure 2. Thus, both Benaloh and Cooper fail to teach or even suggest that each network device in the plurality of network devices is configured to 'selectively' decrypt the received content and to fingerprint or watermark the decrypted content.

Thus, because both Benaloh and Cooper teach that only a first distributor in the flow of the content through their respective delivery systems performs such watermarking/fingerprinting, neither Benaloh nor Cooper, alone or in combination teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references fail to satisfy a *prima facie* case for obviousness. In light of the above response, withdrawal of the rejections of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims (Claims 1-20) is in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicants reserve the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: September 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Jamie L. Wiegand  
Registration No.: 52,361  
DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. Box 770  
Church Street Station  
New York, New York 10008-0770  
(206) 262-8915  
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)  
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant